



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,940	11/25/2003	Rex Coppom	STR0001	8310

25235 7590 07/02/2004  
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP  
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500  
1200 SEVENTEENTH ST  
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

CHIESA, RICHARD L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1724

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/721,940

Applicant(s)

COPPOM ET AL

Examiner

RICHARD L. CHIESA

Group Art Unit

1724

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

## Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the:
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

SN 10/721,940

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

- (1.) The drawings filed on November 25, 2003 are acceptable to the examiner.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102/103*

- (2.) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 USC 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall not be entitled to a patent unless--

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- (3.) The following is a quotation of 35 USC 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(4.) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicants are advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 USC 103(c) and potential 35 USC 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 USC 103(a).

(5.) Claims 1-6, 9-12, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Pick ('372). Pick ('372) discloses a filter media assembly and a method of making the filter as claimed (35 USC 102b). Note Pick ('372)'s pleated fibrous pleated dielectric filter media 4, conductive charging screen electrodes 2, 3, and frame 1. It would appear that Pick ('372) may not explicitly refer to the screens 2 and 3 as "electrodes". However, Pick ('372) does describe that a voltage source supplies voltage to the charging screens (note col. 3, lines 20-47). It is therefore inherent based on this description that the screens 2 and 3 are electrodes or at least would have been readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (35 USC 103a) that they are electrodes.

(6.) Claims 7, 8, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pick ('372) in view of Joannou et al. Pick ('372), as described above in paragraph 5, discloses a filter and filter making method substantially as claimed. Apparently, Pick

(‘372) may not disclose the use of a glue bead to stabilize the filter pleats and affix the conductive electrode. However, Joannou et al (note Figures 5, 5A, 6, 10, 11) teach the well-known use of a glue bead 13 stabilizing the filter pleats 19 and affixing a conductive electrode 7 in a filter assembly and method of production for the purpose of ensuring a strong durable filter unit (note col. 4, lines 17-23, and col. 5, lines 18-58). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ a glue bead in the Pick (‘372) filter and method of making the filter in order to facilitate the stabilization of the filter as taught by Joannou et al.

(7.) Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 13 in paragraph 6 above, and further in view of Stemmer. The prior art, as described above in paragraph 6, discloses a filter making method substantially as claimed with the apparent exception of a heated glue bead. However, Stemmer (note ref. num. 22, Fig. 4, and col. 2, lines 23-27) teaches that this is a well-known expedient in the pleated filter production art for the purpose of ensuring that the filter is properly held together. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a heated glue bead in the prior art filter making method described above in order to facilitate assembly as taught by Stemmer.

(8.) Claims 17-23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pick (‘372) in view of Coppom (‘476). Pick (‘372), as described above in paragraph 5, discloses an air filtration apparatus and method substantially as claimed with the apparent exception of a blower and a grounded electrode collecting accumulated charge. Coppom

('476) teaches the well-known use of a blower 26 and a grounded electrode 42, 44 (note Figures 1-7) collecting accumulated charge in an air filtration apparatus and method for the purpose of draining accumulated charge (note col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a blower and a grounded electrode in the Pick ('372) air filtration apparatus and method in order to facilitate charge draining as taught by Coppom ('476).

(9.) Claim 24 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pick ('372) in view of Chapman. Pick ('372), as described above in paragraph 5, discloses an electrostatically enhanced filter apparatus substantially as claimed with the possible exception of a downstream functional unit using purified air. Chapman (note col. 1, lines 5-62) teaches the well-known use of positioning an electrostatically enhanced air filter upstream of a functional unit using purified air for the purpose of ensuring proper air quality to the functional unit and for this same reason it would have been obvious to employ such an expedient in the Pick ('372) air filter system.

### ***Conclusion***

(10.) The prior art cited but not applied is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure. These references have been cited as art of interest to show other filter assemblies and methods of manufacture.

(11.) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard L. Chiesa whose telephone number is (571) 272-1154.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane S. Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1700 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0987.

Facsimile correspondence must be transmitted through (703) 872-9306.

Richard L. Chiesa  
June 30, 2004

*Richard L. Chiesa*

**RICHARD L. CHIESA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1724**

*June 30, 2004*